

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/718,809	11/24/2003	Jin Young Kim	6661-000021/US	3473
	7590 03/08/200 CKEY & PIERCE, P.L	EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 8910			CHACKO DAVIS, DABORAH	
RESTON, VA 20195			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1756	
SHORTENED STATUTOR	Y PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS 03/08/2007		PAI	ER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

i					
	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/718,809	KIM ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Daborah Chacko-Davis	1756			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period was Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status		•			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 De	<u>ecember 2006</u> .				
2a)⊠ This action is FINAL . 2b)☐ This	This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final.				
	3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is				
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	53 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims					
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) 3-10 is/are withdrawn 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1,2,11 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	from consideration.				
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are; a) access Applicant may not request that any objection to the of Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction. 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner	epted or b) objected to by the Edrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See non is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
Attachment(s) One of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da	ate			
B) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	atent Application			

Application/Control Number: 10/718,809

Art Unit: 1756

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-2, and 11, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Japanese Patent No. 2001-221908 (Furuya) in view of U. S. Patent No. 6,184,403 (Welch et al., hereinafter referred to as Welch).

Furuya, in the abstract, discloses an organic metallic composition comprising the claimed metal complexes, wherein the metallic complexes includes Ag, and Au and one of Cu or Ti or Ta, and that the metals in the metallic complex is further complexed with organic compounds.

The difference between the claims and Furuya is that Furuya does not disclose that the organic compound is the claimed neutral ligand. Furuya does not disclose that the organic-metal complex includes the anion recited in claims 1, and 11. Furuya does not disclose that the organic film complexed with the metal includes the neutral ligand recited in claim 2.

Welch, in the abstract, and in col 2, lines 15-67, and in col 3, lines 21-55, in col 4, lines 27-67, discloses that the organo metallic compounds includes a neutral metallic

ligand such as NR⁹, wherein R⁹ comprises an alkyl group, and a nitro or carboxylate anion.

Therefore, it would be obvious to a skilled artisan to modify Furuya by employing the organic ligands and anions suggested by Welch in the organo-metal complex because Welch, in col 1, lines 66-67, and in col 2, lines 1-4, discloses that the addition of the claimed ligands in the metal complex induces higher volatility in the organo metallic compound, and enables stability of the organo metal complex at the sublimation point, and retains desirable processing features.

Response to Arguments

- 3. Applicant's arguments filed December 19, 2006, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The 103 rejection of claims 1-2, and 11, made in the previous office action (paper no. 20060921) is maintained.
- A) Applicants argue that Furuya does not disclose organometallic compounds I, II, and III are present in an amount or 0.01-10 mol % based on the mole amount of Ag in the organometallic compound (I).

Furuya discloses the claimed organometallic compounds, and provides an alloy of Ag with Au and Pd with a total wt. % of about 3.0 wt. %, and further includes at least Cu at a wt. % of about 3.0 wt.%. The mole percent of the metallic components (calculated) based on Ag mole percent is about 1.3 mol% of Ag, 7.0 mol % of Au, and about 1.3 mol% of Pd. Therefore, Furuya does teach the claimed mol % of metal components. Additionally, In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which

Application/Control Number: 10/718,809

Art Unit: 1756

applicant relies (i.e., "organometallic compounds I, II, and III present in an amount of 0.01-10 mol% based on the mole amount of Ag in the organometallic compound (I)") are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

B) Applicants argue that Welch does not disclose organometallic compounds I, II, and III are present in an amount or 0.01-10 mol % based on the mole amount of Ag in the organometallic compound (I).

Welch is not depended upon to disclose the claimed mol % of organometallic compounds. Furuya is depended upon to disclose the claimed mol % of metallic components of the organometallic compounds. Also see paragraph B).

Conclusion

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Application/Control Number: 10/718,809

Art Unit: 1756

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Daborah Chacko-Davis whose telephone number is (571) 272-1380. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:30 - 6:00. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark F Huff can be reached on (571) 272-1385. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

dcd

March 3, 2007.

SUPERMISORY PATENT E CARRENT TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1799